

REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the diligent and thoughtful review of the presently pending application and the prior art of record. In response to the Final Office Action (“FOA”) mailed on August 3, 2005, Applicant respectfully responds by filing a Request for Continued Examination (“RCE”), amending the claims (as set forth above) and the following Remarks. Specifically, claims 1-22 have been cancelled and new claims 23-63 added thereby rendering moot the outstanding rejections.

More specifically, in the FOA, claims 1-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,060,852 (hereafter “Domel”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,170,108 (hereafter “Peterson”). Claims 8-18, 20/8-18, 21/8-18 and 22/8-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,402,407 (hereafter “Bresson”) in view of Peterson. Claims 19, 20/19, 21/9 and 22/19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bresson in view of Domel.

First, Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for the same reasons set forth in its previously submitted response to the Office Action of February 8, 2005. As noted in the FOA and as stated in the Response of May 3, 2005, Applicant contends that the combination of Domel and Peterson and/or Bresson is improper for the stated reasons. Applicant repeats and incorporates herein its objection to these combinations as being improper and upon such basis contends that each of the previously pending claims is patentable over the prior art of record. Further, in view of these same arguments, each of new claims 23-63 are also patentable over the prior art of record.

Second, in the interest of expediting the allowance of the presently claimed subject matter, Applicant has cancelled the previously pending claims. New claims 23-63 have been added and additionally recite the combination of hardware and software control systems or structures, and/or the use thereof, in conjunction with window coverings controlled by the recited systems and methods. The use of these hardware and software structures separately and/or in conjunction with the variously recited control systems and methods of the new claims are not taught, mentioned or suggested, alone or in combination, by the recited prior art.

Express Mail No. EV 678 762 514 US
Application No. 10/732,747
Reply to Office action of 03 August 2005


Since neither Domel, Peterson nor Bresson, alone or variously combined, teach each of the elements and limitations and/or the various combinations and sub-combinations thereof, as recited in the presently pending claims, each of the claimed systems and methods are patentable over the prior art of record. For at least these reasons, each of claims 23-63 are in form for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

A petition for a one month extension of time to respond to the FOA is hereby requested, making this RCE, Amendment and Response due on or before December 3, 2005. Enclosed is a check in the sum of \$3,460.00 to cover the following fees associated with this filing: \$120.00 for the one month extension of time fee, \$2,550.00 for the additional claim fees, and \$790.00 for the Request for Continued Examination fee. It is believed no further fees are due with respect to the filing of this Amendment; however, if additional petitions or fees are required, please consider this a request therefor and authorization to charge Deposit Account No. 04-1415 accordingly.

Respectfully submitted,

DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP

Date: 01 December 2005

By 
John T. Kennedy
Attorney Reg. No. 42,717
PH: (303) 260-6362
Customer No. 20686

4811-1207-9872\412\1\2005 1:53 PM